

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

WILLIAM LYLE NIBLE,
Plaintiff,
v.
JEFF MACOMBER, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-01259-DJC-CSK (PS)

AMENDED ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S
MOTIONS

(ECF Nos. 100, 101)

Plaintiff William Lyle Nible, who is proceeding pro se, has filed two miscellaneous motions.¹ (ECF Nos. 100, 101). Pursuant to Eastern District of California Local Rule 230(g), the motions are submitted upon the record and the briefs.² For the reasons that follow, the Court GRANTS Plaintiff's motions. The Court issues this Amended Order to correct citations to the ECF docket numbers on pages 1 and 2 of the original order filed on November 26, 2025 (ECF No. 106).³

I. MOTION TO CORRECT THE TRANSCRIPT

On November 3, 2025, Plaintiff filed a motion to correct the transcript for the

¹ This matter proceeds before the undersigned pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, Fed. R. Civ. P. 72, and Local Rule 302(c).

² The district court's Local Rules are accessible on the district court's website: <https://www.caed.uscourts.gov/caednew/index.cfm/rules/local-rules/>.

³ No substantive changes to the original order was made.

1 Court's June 17, 2025 hearing pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60. (ECF No.
2 100.) Plaintiff seeks to correct the transcript at page 5, line 13. *Id.* at 2. The transcript
3 records Plaintiff stating that "They are not allowed to use my prior 290 registration or
4 current law and Missouri Revised Statute 566.1.7. That's, that's settled Missouri law."
5 ECF No. 99 at 5. Plaintiff requests the Court amend the recorded reference from
6 "566.1.7" to "566.147." ECF No. 100 at 2. Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(a),
7 "[t]he court may correct a clerical mistake or a mistake arising from oversight or omission
8 whenever one is found in a judgment, order, or other part of the record." After reviewing
9 the audio for the hearing, the Court confirms the clerical mistake and that the transcript
10 record should be amended to "566.147." Accordingly, the Court grants Plaintiff's motion
11 to correct the transcript and orders the official transcript for the June 17, 2025 hearing be
12 corrected from "566.1.7" on page 5, line 13, to "566.147."

13 **II. MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE LATE OBJECTIONS**

14 On November 3, 2025, Plaintiff also filed a motion for leave to file late objections
15 to the Court's September 22, 2025 findings and recommendations denying Plaintiff's
16 motion to proceed in forma pauperis. (ECF No. 101.) Plaintiff also simultaneously filed
17 his objections to the Court's September 22, 2025 findings and recommendations for the
18 Court's consideration. (ECF No. 102.) Plaintiff's objections were due October 6, 2025.
19 See 9/22/2025 Findings and Recommendations (ECF No. 97). Despite Plaintiff's late
20 filing, the Court will grant Plaintiff's motion and accept Plaintiff's objections filed at ECF
21 No. 102.

22 **III. CONCLUSION**

23 It is HEREBY ORDERED that:

- 24 1. Plaintiff's motion to correct the transcript (ECF No. 100) is GRANTED. The Court
25 orders the June 15, 2025 hearing transcript be corrected on page 5, line 13 from
26 "566.1.7" to "566.147"; and
- 27 2. Plaintiff's motion for leave to file late objections (ECF No. 101) is GRANTED.
28 Plaintiff's objections to the September 22, 2025 findings and recommendations

1 filed at ECF No. 102 are deemed accepted.

2
3 Dated: December 2, 2025

4 
5 CHI SOO KIM
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

6 4, nibl1259.24
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28